UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,700	04/25/2006	Detlev Wittmer	WITT3005/FJD	8701
23364 BACON & THO	7590 01/29/201 OMAS. PLLC	EXAMINER		
625 SLATERS	LANE	WU, JUNCHUN		
FOURTH FLO ALEXANDRIA	OR A, VA 22314-1176		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2191	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/29/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/534,700	WITTMER ET AL.	
Examiner	A =4 1 == 14	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	JUNCHUN WU	2191	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ess
THE REPLY FILED 18 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (\$\frac{1}{2}\$ MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	date of the final rejectio	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the state forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on tending amount on tended statutory period for reply original contents.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u> </u>	wiente the date of filing a brief		
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b They raise new issues that would require further con They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below They are not deemed to place the application in bett 	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);	
appeal; and/or			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mnliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inplication (i	102 024).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	•	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>5-10</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	rercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but see continuation sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (I13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Wei Y Zhen/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191			

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

Applicant argued that reference Diedrich does not teach two steps

- 1). Taking the electrical device descriptions and then generating these descriptions by a first compiler or generator into a syntactically and semantically correct standard device description
- 2). transforming this standard device description also automatically by a second compiler into a software module

Examiner disagree.

On step 1, Diedrich teaches on page 165, 1st paragraph "The device description has to be based on a device model, because of the semantic behind the lexical and syntactical elements." (examiner notes: The device description is syntactically and semantically correct.) Further, Diedrich teaches on page 167, last paragraph "There are two steps within the device description technology. Firstly, the device description has to be generated. This is done by compilers or generators. "(examiner notes: When the device description is generated, it is inherently produced into a syntactically and semantically correct standard device description.) Refer to Fig. 7, the EDD (electronic device description was taken before compiler which is generated device description.

On step 2, Diedrich teaches on page 168, 2nd paragraph "The following tools have to be available (see Figure 7): an editor, a compiler, an interpreter for the handling of the device description, and PC Software with the components HMI interface and API mapping interface for the use of the Device Description by the operator. The editor is the front end to the device manufacturer who provides the machine readable device description. The compiler translates these DDs into the DCOM server format (i.e. software module)"